UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Manifesto to Man - - *Harold P. Marley*

Is Pacifism Quiescent? - *George M. Gibson*

The Nazis in Paris - - - *Kurt D. Singer*

The Church and War - - *Myles D. Blanchard*

Hitler Can't Win, But— - - *David M. Bloch*

We Must Avoid a Spiritual Black-Out
Guinivere Hunter Foley

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS

Edited by Lucia Trent and Ralph Cheyney

VOLUME CXXVII NUMBER 4

Chicago, June, 1941

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Declaration

In this time of growing tension of opinion and intolerance of spirit, it is appropriate that UNITY should reaffirm its position as a journal of liberal opinion.

UNITY is interested in no political party or platform, is bound to no school of philosophy or theology, is the organ of no sect or denomination, and is the voice of no organized movement. Rather is UNITY dedicated to certain underlying principles, namely, freedom, fellowship, and character in religion. It seeks the fulfilment of certain ideals, namely, representative democracy, peace, brotherhood, the commonwealth of man which is the kingdom of God on earth.

In dedication to its principles and in pursuit of its ideals, UNITY maintains the rule of liberty. Its editors, editorial contributors, and correspondents speak with unfettered freedom the convictions of their own minds within the general framework of a journal of liberal opinion. The writers of articles, reviews, and poems present their own ideas, which may, at times, be at variance with those of the editors. UNITY would repress no utterance and control no argument that is competent and honest, for it is skeptical of conformity and averse to authority, which always tend to hamper individual liberty. It is happy in those diversities of gifts and ideas which are the glory of the one spirit.

In this period of trial and crisis, UNITY would unite anew its editors and readers in the service of *Character* which is the substance of religion, *Freedom* which is its life, and *Fellowship* which is its goal. Thus would we vindicate our country, our civilization, our culture, religious and lay, in a period when all alike are threatened with extinction.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
America—The Altar of Democracy—CURTIS W. REESE 55
Editorials—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 56
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 59
ARTICLES—
Manifesto to Man—HAROLD P. MARLEY 59
Is Pacifism Quiescent?—GEORGE M. GIBSON 60
The Nazis in Paris—KURT D. SINGER 63
The Church and War—MYLES D. BLANCHARD 64
Hitler Can't Win, But— —DAVID M. BLOCH 65
We Must Avoid a Spiritual Black-Out—GUINIVERE HUNTER FOLEY 66
POETRY—
Respite—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 58
TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
What Will You Say?—LILITH LORRAINE 62
Beyond Hamlet—E. MERRILL ROOT 62
Above the Guns—RUTH LE PRADE 62
Refugees—ETHEL GREEN RUSSELL 62
War's Oasis—WILL STRONG 62
Progress of Science—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 62
THE STUDY TABLE—
Logical and Evangelistic—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 67
Book Notes—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 68
THE FIELD—
Avalon Poetry Shrine 54
Summer Assembly 54

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

THE FIELD

Avalon Poetry Shrine

Ralph Cheyney assumed curatorship of the Avalon Poetry Shrine with his poet wife, internationally known as Lucia Trent, on the evening of March 7th. This announcement was made by Lilith Lorraine, eminent poet and story writer who founded this unique institution last June.

In moving their Dreamer's House to the Avalon Poetry Shrine, Ralph Cheyney and Lucia Trent plan many activities of benefit to the poets of America, under the inspiration and direction of Lilith Lorraine. In so doing they seek suggestions and coöperation.

They plan to extend the Avalon Poetry Shrine Library until it becomes one of the largest libraries of contemporary American poetry. It requests that poets send it autographed copies of their books, preferably first editions. A phonograph library preserving poems in their authors' own voices is also being collected. Books and records will be loaned to responsible individuals and groups.

Already framed poems, photographs, and biographical data of many leading poets are on display on the walls of the Shrine. This collection as a means of familiarizing the many visitors to the Shrine, where visitors are always warmly welcome, with the personalities as well as work of contemporary American poets is to be extended. Each poet is invited to send to the Avalon Poetry Shrine, Route 8, Box 83-F, San Antonio, Texas, preferably by express, a framed original autographed poem with a small photograph in the upper left-hand corner and in the left-hand margin under the photograph a few words about himself. Size should be 8x10 inches or less.

The Shrine sponsors a newspaper column: "The Raven's Roost," for which it solicits brief poems, offering a monthly cash prize.

Special programs presenting noted poets will be held from time to time in addition to the regular meetings and classes of the Avalon Poetry Forum; and candle ceremonies will honor poets' birthdays.

Summer Assembly

The Lake Geneva Summer Assembly for Religious Liberals will be held at Conference Point, Williams Bay, Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, June 15-22. The Conference will include the Mid-West Religious Education Institute, the Mid-West Y. P. R. U. Conference, the Women's Alliance Workshop, and the Laymen's League Mid-West Convention.

Among the subjects to be discussed at the various classes and seminars are "Sources for Individual Religious Living," "Church School Administration," "Young People's Work in the Educational Program of the Church," and others of similar nature.

The administrative officers are: Dean, Tracy M. Pullman of Detroit; Assistant to the Dean, Edward W. Ohrenstein of Hinsdale, Ill.; Secretary, Lon Ray Call of Chicago; Registrar, Bertha C. Finger of Louisville, Kentucky.

For information concerning accommodations and rates, write to Western Unitarian Conference, 330 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVII JUNE, 1941 No. 4

EDITORIAL

AMERICA—THE ALTAR OF DEMOCRACY

CURTIS W. REESE

President Roosevelt has spoken of America as the arsenal of democracy. This suggests a service that America can and should render to the hard-pressed opponents of Nazi aggression. Such a service America is now performing with increasing speed and effectiveness. It is my hope that this speed can be increased and this effectiveness multiplied. In a real sense the hope of democratic liberty depends on America's arsenal.

Vice-President Wallace has spoken of America as the granary of democracy. This, too, suggests a service that America can and should render to the nations whose food resources are being depleted by the ravages of the aggressor, and whose belts are being tightened as they battle for the preservation of at least a minimum of human freedom.

The arsenal and the granary are mutually supporting. Neither can be successful without the other. Both must be fully devoted, to the full measure of their capacity, to the cause of freedom. Only so can peoples throughout the world have another chance to build the kind of democracy that good people everywhere have longed to build, and which to a limited extent they have achieved over wide areas that are now threatened by the weight of overpowering invasion.

But an arsenal and a granary are not enough. The arsenal cannot be effective, nor the granary sufficient, unless America is also the altar of democracy. Here on these shores, on these wide plains and high mountains; here where nature has lavished gifts in abundant profusion; here where the protection of oceans and distance has thus far spared us from the horrors experienced by other portions of the globe;—here in America we must purify and consecrate democracy, and so make it more worthy of preserving for our children, and more worthy of extending to the remotest corners of all the continents and to the smallest islands of all the seas.

Precedent to such purification and consecration, there must be deep-felt recognition that we have not yet attained democracy; that we have fallen far short of even our imperfect understanding of democracy; that we have at times deliberately sinned against the ideals of democracy; and that in unnumbered ways we have abused our heritage and failed in our opportunities. I commend to the hosts of democracy in America such penitence as will evidence a genuine desire to forsake the evils that have shamed and mocked us. Because our professions have been great, our failures are all the more grave.

Penitence, however, must not exhaust itself in regrets. There must be a great commitment also. Our democracy must rise from the altar with a new vision of things that should be and an unfaltering determination to make them what they could be.

In hours like these through which we are passing, when consciences are a bit more sensitive and minds more alert than usual in less strenuous times, we should reëxamine our understanding of what democracy means in terms of devotion and sacrifice as well as of security and peace; in terms of responsibility and progressive development as well as of present safety and past achievements. This we must do at home, not as an excuse for failure to do our duty abroad but as part of our preparation for the larger responsibilities, world-wide in scope, that now rest upon American shoulders.

It is a sobering process to think of America's role in determining the immediate outcome of the present world crisis; and it is even more sobering to think of America's role in the days and the years ahead. The march of events for the last century has placed America in a position of great power and of greater responsibility. We possess such political, economic, and technical strength that we could not, even if we would, return to the old isolation. By circumstances and events we are committed to a large role in the world affairs of the future.

To religious-minded people this situation presents a challenge of the first magnitude. That challenge is nothing less than to make American democracy eminently worthy of the loyalty of the citizenry at home

and of the confidence of the multitudes abroad. There must be no rationalization of the wrongs suffered by minority groups; no attempted justification of poverty amid plenty; and no excuse for terrorism and abuse. We must see to it that wrongs are righted, that poverty is eliminated, and that justice prevails for all.

To this large task of purifying and consecrating democracy at home, and of extending the ideal and the fact of democracy abroad, every religious-minded person should commit himself fully. Then and then only shall America become in truth the altar of democracy.

EDITORIALS

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

Yes, that is what the President said—as he has said, and promised, so many other things. *That he would not take us into war!* Thus, on September 11, 1940, he said: "I stand with my party upon the platform adopted at Chicago . . . 'we will not participate in a foreign war.'" On October 30, 1940, he said, speaking to the fathers and mothers of the country, "I have said this before, and I shall say it again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars." On November 3, 1940, he said, "The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war." These pledges would seem to be clear. They mean, if they mean anything as spoken in a political campaign, that the President, if elected, would keep this nation out of the European mess. But times have changed, say his apologists, resorting to the argument always appealed to in the case of broken promises. The war has grown worse than anybody could have imagined last autumn. Europe's plight is desperate, England's fall seems imminent. The President spoke in the light of what was going on when he spoke, and could not have foreseen the present situation. But what *was* the situation when he spoke as quoted above? Answer that question, if you will! Norway and Denmark had been overrun by Germany; Belgium and Holland had been swept clean by the ravage of German arms, and 20,000 or more people in Amsterdam slaughtered by German bombers in a single attack; France had been broken and laid low; England had heroically rescued the wreck of her great continental army from Dunkirk, and was awaiting a Nazi invasion more terribly possible then than now; Churchill had assured his government and people that he had nothing to offer them but "blood, toil, tears and sweat." The summer of 1940 was the most horrible in modern history. It recorded what seemed to be complete disaster for the English cause, and complete victory for the German cause. And it was into this black midnight that Mr. Roosevelt looked and said, "we will not participate in a foreign war." And every moment since the election he has been moving steadily toward this very participation which he had himself repudiated—and we are all but in! What are the President's promises worth?

II

President Roosevelt is fond of Longfellow. In the personal letter which he gave to Mr. Willkie to deliver to the British Prime Minister, he quoted a stanza from "The Building of the Ship," as follows:

> . . . Sail on, O Ship of State!
> Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
> Humanity with all its fears,
> With all the hopes of future years,
> Is hanging breathless on thy fate.

This pleased the Prime Minister—he quoted the passage in his February 9th speech. Among other things, I suppose, he was glad to find a literate man in the White House. One can imagine what Andrew Jackson, or Zachary Taylor, or Warren Gamaliel Harding would have done with this sort of thing! But if the President is so devoted to Longfellow, I wonder why he does not read farther. There are several poems I would like to suggest for his pondering. One in particular, brought to mind by the President's famous remark about making this country an "arsenal for democracy"! That seemed to me, and still seems, a sad disillusionment of the American dream. What would Washington and Jefferson and Franklin think thus to be told that, after a hundred and sixty years, the land for which they gave so much had become an "arsenal"? What would the generations of patriots and pioneers say at this declaration that, in the greatest crisis in modern history, America had no higher mission than that of serving as a manufactory of guns and bullets? An "arsenal"! Well, let the President get down his Longfellow, and consult the Index of Titles. There, in the first column, he will find "Arsenal at Springfield, The." Turning (in my edition) to page 78, he will find eight stirring stanzas describing the horrors of war—"the cries of agony," "the endless groan," "the wail of famine," "the bursting shell," "the tumult of each sacked and burning village." Profoundly moved, the poet goes on:

> Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
> Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
> Given to redeem the human mind from error,
> There were no need of arsenals and forts:
>
> The warrior's name would be a name abhorréd!
> And every nation that should lift again
> Its hand against a brother, on its forehead
> Would wear forevermore the curse of Cain!

Yes, Mr. President, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow is a great poet—far greater than you think!

III

How we fool ourselves! Or how we are fooled!! Do you remember what wonderful fighters the Poles were, and how the Polish cavalry, the greatest in the world, was going to fight off the Germans indefinitely? And what happened to Poland? Do you remember the encomiums lavished upon the Serbs—what superb guerrilla fighters they were, and how they would take to their native hills and resist the invading Germans until the snows of next winter stopped the fighting? And how many days did the Serbs hold out? The Finns are another example. The most gallant of all peoples, without doubt! But what evidence was there in 1939-40 that they could hold off the Russian hordes? Not a vestige. Yet we lived for weeks in the glamor of the dream, partly conjured up by excited and sentimental correspondents at the front that the Russians were going to be defeated. One wonders how long this wishful thinking is going on. Already we are being told about the incomparable fighting qualities of the Turks —a sure indication that Turkey is to be prepared and garnished for the next grand act of European slaughter. Are the Turks good fighters? They are! Can they stop the invasion of German mechanized units? They cannot. A few days, at the most a few weeks, and the Turks will be as hopelessly beaten as the Jugo-Slavs or the Greeks! We pacifists are constantly being taunted for being unrealistic. But if there is any group of people these days who are living in a world of fantasy and moonshine, it seems to me it is the militarists. These politicians and diplomats and soldiers, these premiers and presidents—they have guessed every last thing wrong since this war started. And they may be counted upon to guess every last thing wrong in the future, as in the past, until under present policies final destruction has engulfed us all. And yet we are told that we must heed their words, support their programs, follow in their footsteps. Does all this mean that the Nazis are unbeatable—that we must just surrender and die? *Not at all!* It simply means that there are forces of destruction in this world and forces of salvation; that, if we resort to the forces of destruction to defeat our enemy, we must be stronger than our enemy, and therefore outdo him and become more terrible than he is; that, in this crisis, we may resort to the forces of salvation, and therewith through God win a victory worth winning. But this is pacifism, and who will listen?

IV

Ever since this war started, I have systematically denounced the idea that this country is in danger of invasion. In addition, I have deliberately ridiculed the idea, believing that irony is a more effective weapon against hysterical people than serious argument. I have attacked the President on this score, since his talk about submarines off our coast (there were no submarines off our coast when the President spoke, and have been none since!), about the bombing of Omaha, or was it Kansas City (every aeronautical expert laughed merrily at this fear!), about Nazis in Greenland (there were no Nazis in Greenland, and are not now!), this White House talk, I say, has done more than anything else to stir the public to panic. Now comes a final authority to silence all this wild speechifying about invasion—Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, in his new book, *United We Stand.* Mr. Baldwin, military expert of the New York *Times,* described by a reviewer as one of the men to be counted on the fingers of one hand "who have observed the armed forces of other world powers . . . and have analyzed our defense policies," this authoritative writer agrees with Colonel Lindbergh and "all military observers" that *the United States cannot be invaded from the air* —which means, of course, in these days that it cannot be invaded at all! Let us have done with this silliness! Mr. Baldwin is interesting on another point—namely, conscription. We pacifists denounced this conscription law a year ago as unnecessary. Mr. Baldwin now condemns it as harmful. We were stampeded, he says, into this business of pouring into the army a lot of raw recruits who will never be any good since one year's training is all too short. As a result, he declares, not a single army unit is fit to take the field, and next fall the situation will be no better. Whiplashed again by official hysteria, we have sacrificed quality for mass, in an age when quality is indispensable. As to our general defense policy, Mr. Baldwin finds everywhere confusion and indirection. The army and navy are all at sea, because nobody knows "where they are going to fight, or who." Our present program of defense, says Mr. Baldwin, will neither insure peace nor win a war. Our one need, if we are to accomplish anything, is unity—and the President, writes Mr. Baldwin, "has contributed more greatly to disunity than any other single individual." To think of Mr. Roosevelt at this moment is to think of what history will do with him in the days ahead. That judgment is pretty terrible to contemplate.

V

Lunacy incident to war hysteria still continues. It seems incredible the things that otherwise sane people do! But, like Amos an' Andy, "here they are." A resident of Portland, Maine, motoring along the state highway, noticed a cross painted on a pole. He reported a swastika which must be "a sign to touring bund members that there was a German camp in the vicinity." Investigation showed that the cross had been made after a geographic survey by government engineers, to indicate that the area had been measured and

examined. * * * The Andrew Jackson Chapter of the United States Daughters of 1812 is protesting against the Army's abolition of the salute off duty. The Chapter insists that this is an importation of Red Army custom from Communist Russia. * * * The Council of National Defense is publishing a series of booklets on air-raid precautions, roughly similar to those brought out in England. * * * Secretary of the Navy Knox praised newspapers which suppressed all announcement of the arrival in New York of a torpedoed British battleship which entered the harbor in broad daylight, anchored off the Narrows for every passerby to see, displayed a hole in her side easily discernible a mile away, and scattered her sailors (with caps carefully labelled) through the streets of the city on shore leave. * * * Still beset by the nightmare of a Nazi invasion, the President has occupied Greenland. * * * The War Department has started a volunteer air-raid observers' corps, to consist of 500,000 to 600,000 civilians to watch the skies. * * * On a recent night Pittsburgh was blacked out under "the pounding of an enemy bombardment." The test proved, we are told, what an easy prey the industrial area might be to enemy aircraft! * * * A New York City official has announced that every man, woman and child in the metropolis is to be enrolled in a defense organization to save the city under attack. When asked what each man, woman or child was to do, the official did not know, but they are all to be enrolled. * * * *Newsweek* announces that British bomb manufacturers are selling options on aerial bombs to members of a group organized in this country called "Bombardiers, Ltd." Options are turned over to the R. A. F. which agrees to give exact information as to time and place when bombs are used. * * * Mrs. Roosevelt, in an article in the *Saturday Evening Post,* recommends a system of conscription of women to match conscription of men. * * * The *New Republic* is publishing war atrocity tales to match the best produced in the last war. * * * And amid all this excitement, Smith College believes that it can best contribute to the interests of the nation by continuing uninterruptedly its work of education.

VI

The sheer hysteria of all this nonsense as listed in the above editorial is nowhere more clearly indicated than in the field of sabotage, and nowhere more emphatically ridiculed and denounced, thank heaven, than by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the famous F. B. I. In an important article in the *Christian Science Monitor* (May 3rd), a spokesman of the F. B. I. tells the people to calm down. "The important thing now," this agent declares, "is for people to keep their common sense, their balance." Everywhere is this hysteria, this insane madness of excitement and terror. "In a single day," says this F. B. I. man, "we get 2,871 complaints from people who believe this thing or that needed looking into." Such a state of mind creates "a condition valuable to any enemy"—that of a nation stampeded in groundless alarm and dismay. Take this sabotage business! Anything in it? "Good headlines," says this G-man in the *Christian Science Monitor.* "The headlines on the front page are almost as good as the fantastic spy plots and counterplots in the comics on the next to the last page. And sometimes they both have about the same foundation in fact." Look at the cases which in recent months have turned the newspapers into screaming scaremongers and the public into a mass of maniacs! The United Railway Signal explosion at Woodbridge, N. J., for example—"probably negligence," says this F. B. I. agent, "no reason to believe that a saboteur attacked the plant." The explosions in the Trojan Powder Company at Allentown, Pa., and the American Cyanamid and Chemical plant at New Castle, Pa.—"we believe they were accidental." The famous Maine report of 75 fire extinguishers in a shipyard all loaded with gasoline—"no truth whatever to the report." The fire on the *S. S. Dakota* under construction at Camden, N. J.—"resulted from the fact that a rivet heater came too close to a rubber hose." The fire aboard the destroyer *Gynn* in the Boston Navy Yard—caused by "a fire igniting a scaffolding . . . absolutely no hint of sabotage, except in the headlines." The burning of the National Guard Armory in Atlanta—"we don't think it was sabotage." Summing it all up, this spokesman says, *"There have been no organized acts of sabotage in the United States since the war began in Europe."* What is fearful about all this, as about all these bombing yarns and silly defense measures against non-existing dangers (see above editorial!), is "the danger to national morale," to quote our F. B. I. man again. In the very effort to make the people alert, we scare them to death and thus produce the hysteria now prevalent throughout the length and breadth of this unhappy land. Let us be sensible for a change—and sane!

Respite

Can Spring its gay parenthesis impart,
In deft abandon, as it used to do,
And wash its wistful winds of lightness through
The blind rebellion of the life-sick heart?

Oh, for some blest amnesia of the brain
To blot out background, and distort the eye
To see but swallows circling in the sky,
And only green invasion on the plain!

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE.

Jottings

"The British Commonwealth is the champion of Christendom. It is fighting for the principles of the Sermon on the Mount."

Church Times

"This war is a holy war."

JOHN BAILLIE.

This business of sanctifying what General Sherman called "hell" came a little more slowly in this war than in the last war—but here it is again!

In an article in *Collier's,* advertised as an "answer to Lindbergh," Wendell Willkie says:

"The capital of the world tomorrow will be Berlin or Washington. I want it to be Washington."

So Mr. Willkie agrees with Colonel Lindbergh, after all—that England is out of it! Then why "answer" him?

"Britain after the war will not tolerate the scourge of unemployment."

LLOYD GEORGE, City Temple, 1917.

"Britain after the war will not tolerate . . . the scourge of unemployment."

ARTHUR GREENWOOD, January 13, 1941.

Thus do we fool ourselves!

The way the United States is being lured into this war is for all the world like a moth being lured into a candle flame.

"Reports have reached Washington that Hitler has abandoned his plan to invade England. . . . Hitler no longer believes it will be possible, short of filling up Dover Strait with his dead, for him to cross the English Channel with a sufficient force to conquer Britain."

WILLIAM P. SIMS,
in the New York *World Telegram.*

And there are still Americans who can't sleep o'nights for fear of Hitler's invading America which lies not across the Channel but across the Atlantic Ocean!

High among Hitler's triumphs must be rated the conquest of Italy. His soldiery are as definitely in charge of the peninsula as of Holland or occupied France. And it all began with a ranting Nazi demagogue imitating the great Italian Fascist. How are the mighty fallen!

James Hilton, in his new novel, *Random Harvest,* speaks of the recruiting posters in England in 1914 which read, "What did you do in the Great War?" and remarks that in those days "even the most cynical of us couldn't see ahead to a time when the only logical answer to that question would be another one—*'Which* Great War?' "

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Manifesto to Man

HAROLD P. MARLEY

With every crisis in human history comes a corresponding change in the thinking of the race. The crisis period between the two World Wars brought about a restatement of religion along scientific lines. It was called the Humanist Manifesto, and was signed by a number of religious leaders and others who had come to the position that man, and man alone, can control his destiny.

With this destiny in the balance, and with a retreat going on in the field of religion to old categories, it was boldly set forth that all religious truth is derived through experience rather than intuition; that social evils must be corrected by intelligence and planning; and that the imperatives to constructive living can come from social awareness and from within, without recourse to the idea of God.

Today, with world conditions so chaotic, many of the signers of the original Manifesto are suggesting that they reaffirm the Humanist position in religion, and invite others to join them in signing the new statement. Since the original publication, such well-known authors as Lin Yutang and Max Lerner have espoused the position of Humanism in their writings. The revision, like the original, would not be negative or cavalier, but would regard Humanism as the logical flowering-out of all religious striving. Thus, if religion is to survive, Humanism has a sufficiently broad base to stabilize present vacillation, and the evolutionary characteristic to lead the way to the new world order.

Three basic imperatives stand out, which, because of their essential human elements, ought to be manifest to all thoughtful people throughout the world. In the first place: man must live. Basic to the present crisis is the insecurity of people. A new economy in a decadent system is striving to be born, while outgrown economies are prolonging themselves through Fascist formulas. Communities must eventually own and control their particular means of production, and governments must control the distribution of goods thus produced, making for an integrated national life and for world stability. Until the basic problem of existence is solved, there will always be social strife and world war. The second imperative is man must live with others. Many social issues, which are apparent today, will remain, even with an adjustment of the economic base upon which society rests. Some of them can be treated by indirection—by dealing with causes rather than symptoms, thus avoiding the legalistic approach to life. By stressing the community, rather than the old trinity of church, school and home, a new creativity will result, growing out of democratic group activity in the fields of industry, education, and recreation. Where institutions are involved, there must be

safeguards to guarantee continuing creativity, but it is recognized that the best arrangement of society is a free association of people, freely entered into for specific purposes and a limited end.

In the third place, man must live with himself. Mental hygiene must play an increasing role, and its principles should therefore be learned early in life. Although many personal conflicts arising from basic insecurity or social maladjustments will disappear, problems within the human mind will go on. Entire vistas of the inner life may either be explored or be blocked out by fears and foolish inhibitions. Through training and example, every individual can strive for those skills and perfections which he deliberately chooses for himself.

This threefold credo, implemented in practice by the findings and methods of economics, sociology, and psychology, points toward the well-integrated individual, adjusted to his surroundings, for it is evident that man's greatest single failure through all history has been his inability to adjust—man to man, group to group, class to class, and nation to nation. Ofttimes, the person will need to alter his environment rather than himself, for the theory of progress indicates that surroundings cannot long remain inhospitable to human aims and aspirations.

The way to achieve these basic imperatives is the inspiration of the arts and the method of science, which by its very nature implies tolerance, sympathy, coöperation, and an expectancy of change. The end is artistic behavior, for without art industry and learning is brutality. The new trinity of the economic, the sociological, and the psychological can give fresh meaning and rational content to the "spiritual," and resolve old dualisms such as individualism versus conformity; the sacred versus the secular; or the status quo versus progress. The role of leadership requires special training of individuals and movements in methods of progress, which can be shared by the group in a democratic process rather than in utopian scheming.

The role of religion is to integrate this new trinity and to interpret man to himself in such a way that he will have enthusiasm for his ideals and will exert the necessary sacrifice to translate them into action. This action-content of religion distinguishes it from philosophy, which is more descriptive, and from ethics, which is more legalistic. In society, religion must interpret one group to another, emphasizing the fact that social sin (as practiced, say, by great corporations, and shrouded by powerful newspaper chains) is the great unpunished crime of our day. In the realm of nature, religion can make available nature's wealth of aesthetic value, together with an awe and wonder at the structure and size of the universe. When religion goes indoors, it can personalize the virtues of man and the beauties of nature in such vivid fashion that these will be living values. No doubt, these personifications will be less personal than the God concept, but they will therefore be less liable to take from man that prerogative of action which must always, in the last analysis, rest with him. The church service of aspiration has within it the unique possibility of keeping life sacred in an age of disillusionment by grouping all the arts about an ethical core so that self-discipline and social understanding will be heightened.

Finally, let the new Humanist statement be for all men. If some believe in God, let this Manifesto be a foundation for responsible theistic thinking; if others do not, let them use this credo as a means of escaping the negative aspects of atheism. If men spurn religion, let them not become experts in the shortcomings of religion, but let them avow something equally noble. If there be reformers, and there must be, let them be honored, and let them honor the high calling of those who have reformed before. But, let all men be human and enjoy their humanity. Let them not live in the shadow of man's fourth imperative, death, but let them treat this ultimate reality in the grand life epoch as having the peculiar power of disengaging personality from time and space. Through the wise use of the faculties of memory and imagination, man can live in the ages before his birth, and can hold communion with that which is to come, for we are what we remember, and our tomorrow is born today.

Is Pacifism Quiescent?

GEORGE M. GIBSON

Pacifism is a positive, creative force, and not a negative denial. If it is not that, it is not pacifism. Those who criticize it for inaction are right to be against inaction in the face of injustice, but wrong to assume inaction to be of pacifism's essence. The charge must be met, not with impassioned disclaimers, but with creative activity that will leave no doubt as to where the main thrust of the movement is. And the movement should recognize its peculiar temptation toward negativism, meeting criticism as a stimulus toward more courageous and resultful endeavor.

The peace hope cannot rest upon the truism that "wrong is self-defeating and right self-perpetuating." Like all truisms this is a half-truth, and one that may lead toward total moral paralysis. Wrong is self-defeating only in the sense that it occasions sufferings which may prove a stimulus toward meeting the conditions for disposing of the wrong and establishing the right. To rout out wrong calls for the positive act of redemption which is the very antithesis of acquiescence, and the only hope lies in making the redemptive forces more powerful than the forces of tyranny.

Pacifism must confess itself a long way from that goal as yet, which should inspire the movement to greater disciplined effort. There is plausibility in the plea of non-pacifists that "something must be done" about the terrors that confront humanity, and one can understand why honest non-pacifists are not too deeply impressed with the mere oratory of peace. What they do not understand is that the prerequisite for the development of positive techniques is the renunciation of the conventional methods of meeting violence with violence, and that war as a method must be renounced even in advance of the perfection of alternative methods, with full assumption of consequences for that renunciation. As long as we rely upon the war method for use "as a last resort," we are not likely to be spurred to adopt the method which is in every way the opposite of the war method.

Since the first concern is for clear understanding,

certain recurring charges against pacifism must be met. These charges reflect only the confusion in the minds of the non-pacifists, and do not properly apply to the pacifist movement itself. It thus becomes necessary to point out what pacifism is *not*.

It is not a mere desire for peace. Many well-informed speakers are using it in this erroneous sense. Even the President in a fireside talk said, "I am a pacifist," proceeding then to a justification for the defense program. Such use of the term indicates something. At least the word is not at present a term of opprobrium. Even those associated with interventionist programs feel under some need for stressing their peace aims. Naturally a strong desire for peace is a prerequisite of pacifism, but the movement is in no sense defined by that desire alone. More exactly speaking, pacifism is that age-old *desire* for peace entering its program phase. And the first part of the program is renunciation of war. That the program is still unshaped, its techniques still largely undiscovered, proves nothing except that it is in the making. But there has been enough of refinement of ideology and testing of methods to rescue the movement from the obscurity caused by loose use of its distinctive name. In any adequate definition of pacifism the movement must be shown as one not only desiring peace, but renouncing war.

Next, pacifism is not isolationism. Events may manuever it into temporary bed-fellowship with isolationist movements, just as they maneuver idealistic interventionism into partnership with reactionary patriotism. But pacifism seeks no splendid isolation in economic autarchy, nor rests its case upon tactical safety behind thousands of miles of ocean. Many of the "stay out of war" arguments do not legitimately belong to pacifist ideology. The essence of isolationism is anti-sociality. It assumes an irresponsible attitude toward the world beyond its own national borders. It assumes that a country may deny the interrelatedness of the whole world-life. Its politics is one of national sovereignty; its economics, autarchy; its culture, provincial; its morals and ethics that of national self-interest. The difficulty of this position, aside from its being immoral, is that it is impossible. Its principles may not be adopted by all nations without inevitably producing war. Its autarchic economy is a proposal rather than a fact, and a proposal which to make possible would necessitate the socialization of the resources of the nation in self-containment. Yet proponents of isolationism as an international policy are opponents of socialization within, which would be the only possible basis for self-containment.

Quite on the contrary, pacifism is a world-view. Those who charge it with isolationist irresponsibility simply do not understand its claims. For it is neither isolationist, nor irresponsible. It sees world responsibility in other than military terms, breaking with the war system which, in itself, is the essence of irresponsibility. Its very sense of world-scale social responsibility for every nation and every colony is its impelling restraint against arms by which that responsibility is denied. Its sense of responsibility is not only space-wide, but time-long, including the remoter causes of the war along with the immediate occasions, and promoting the attitude of responsible penitence for the actions and inactions of its own nation which have been productive of war tempers. Pacifism, then, must dissociate itself from the irresponsibility of isolationism, and non-pacifists who would keep their honesty would do well to cease using these opposed views as synonymous.

A third negative is that pacifism is not appeasement. It does not throw things as gifts or bribes to the attackers hoping that they may be temporarily turned from their maraudings while the victims prepare a better resistance. Appeasement as practiced at Munich was an intimate part of the total war-effort. A vast deal of damage was done the pacifist cause when the Chamberlain visit was interpreted as a pacifist move. Realistic pacifists understood at the time that such a move would be productive of nothing but perhaps a little gaining of time.

Refusing to give hostages to the war method, the realistic pacifist must also refuse to give hostages to tyranny. This does not mean he is unwilling to correct original injustices of which tyranny is in part the product. He is still against those original injustices, whether in his own country or others, and though the immediate prospect of tyranny obscures them as the "remoter" causes of conflict. When the effort is made to stop tyranny without the correction of its fundamental causes and excuses, the result will necessarily be simply another tyranny stronger than the first. The tactic of appeasement gives encouragement to aggressors and furnishes evidence for their claim that only through a show of force can fundamental injustices be dealt with. Appeasement, thus, has two major errors from the standpoint of pacifism. First, in ignoring remoter causes of present tyranny and offering no promise for their correction except by show of force; and, second, in joining its concessions to an implied threat of future force when the time is ripe, thus giving added stimulus to military preparation on the part of the aggressors.

Pacifism would base its concessions on justice and not on fear. It would seek to convey an honest impression of honest intentions toward its potential foe, thus undercutting the otherwise reasonable arguments in the enemy camp that the only effective means are those of force. The real effectiveness of this unambiguous effort toward international justice requires its being worked *before* the appearance of hostile animus. (The Weimar Republic was the appointed time for a fundamental adjustment.) Once tyranny has appeared as the desperate response of a defeated nation to its humiliation, concessions are difficult if not practically impossible. Though repentance were clean and motives perfectly pure, concessions made under direct threat would be almost certain to be misinterpreted as motivated by fear rather than by justice, and would be considered a victory for the arms-threat of tyranny. It is not valid argument against pacifism that it finds the going hard *after* non-pacifist methods have produced their inevitable *cul-de-sac*. By that time pacifism is maneuvered into a dilemma in which it must seem to encourage tyranny on the one hand, or to resist the claims to legitimate justice which, on the other hand, give tyranny its plausibility. The meeting of that dilemma calls for the extreme of moral courage and faith, and pacifist strategy must have the long-run in view, rather than the immediate; meantime, being conscious of the dire consequences of its decisions.

There are three clues to the pacifist technique in such a situation. Having first of all clearly dissociated itself from the war method and all its deceits, it will offer as complete coöperation as possible with all programs of good will, amelioration, and even partial corrections of fundamental injustices at home and

abroad. Second, it will confront all demands of tyranny, in its own country or abroad, with as complete non-coöperation as possible. Third, recognizing that justice is impossible as between two or more sovereign parties to a dispute, it will lend every encouragement to the creation of such a mind as will establish supernational agencies of adjudication.

Such a strategy is not quiescent, but on the contrary calls for tremendous moral energy in the discovery and use of other than conventional military forces. Injustice is not self-corrective, nor has it, in all of history, been corrected by armed resistance. Seeing this, realistic pacifism sees the real issue, and asks: What are the possible powers at the disposal of creative good will which offer themselves for rigorous cultivation in a disciplined movement? Such a movement will remain a faith rather than a blueprint. Its final test is not purely pragmatic.

But, if such forces are not discoverable, both in the actual and in the potential, then the question that has occupied our minds these last two decades has been answered. That question has been: Is war inevitable? And the answer will be, if no other forces are found, an affirmative one. Pacifism is not willing to make that answer. There is a reasonable ground for this faith that war may and must be ultimately outlawed. The very existence of general war today demonstrates that the way has not yet been found and followed. This calls for a girding up for a new beginning upon the practical program phase of the movement, in the spirit of rigorous discipline.

Trumpets on New Horizons

EDITED BY LUCIA TRENT, RALPH CHEYNEY

What Will You Say?

What will you say, dark masters
Of fire and steel and flame,
When from your soul-stained altars
A Voice shall call your name?

A voice no gun can silence,
Nor choke with molten lead,
Unborn battalions marching
To songs you dreamed were dead.

What will avail tomorrow
The lies your mad lips speak,
Before your final judges:
The lowly and the meek?

LILITH LORRAINE.

Beyond Hamlet

Like spiders the clouds descend
And weave the webs of the fog.

Houses like blunt black flies
Loom in the shimmering threads;
And man's heart, like a butterfly tired
Of struggle, is caught in them too.

(Seven days has the rain
Fallen—a glimmering net
Snaring the joy of the world.)

I was not born for the fog!
Mine is the sky of the fierce
Fire-maned puma, the sun,
Hunting the shadows that hide—
Grey deer—behind boulder or tree;
Or mine is the sky of the storm
When riders on stallions of cloud
Fling out their coiled lariats
Of flame, around steeple or oak.

Stretch out your arm, the wind,
O world, and scatter the webs
Of the pearl-grey spiders of cloud.
Shatter the death of our lives
With tumult of lightning or sun!

E. MERRILL ROOT.

Above the Guns

Above the guns, above the hate,
I hear a bird that sings.
Above the hate, above the guns,
It flashes high on flaming wings.

Oh, Lovely Bird, Oh, Bird of Love,
Singing above man's wrong,
Teach us to put our hate away
And break the cannon's mouth with song!

RUTH LE PRADE.

Refugees

They rise and fall in a sea of dreams,
A foundering caravan,
In odorous rags as tattered as hopes
Of the very poorest man.

Not even hungered children cry
To break the silent tide;
The aged and the young; the rich and the poor
Are drifting side by side.

No quibbling now of faiths or creeds. . .
No claims on saints above. . .
The rags of the poor; the pearls of the rich
Baptized in a sea of Love.

ETHEL GREEN RUSSELL.

War's Oasis

Again the Horsemen ride across a fearful world;
Their wanton fires rage, their hell-hot breath
Sears all against whom their hate is hurled . . .
A continent in the somber throes of Death!

On guard America! Democracy must stand!
Ours a sacred trust . . . work without surcease;
Keep the heritage of Freedom! Our land
A calm oasis to nest the doves of Peace.

WILL STRONG.

Progress of Science

Science, with slow laborious care and skill,
Trails every germ, and battles every ill,—
The same wise science whose life-saving hands
Shape weapons to depopulate whole lands!

STANTON A. COBLENTZ.

The Nazis in Paris

KURT D. SINGER

Midday approaches in the *Champs Elysees.* A clock begins to strike, and with it, punctual to the second, approaching from the *Place de l'Etoile,* come the aggressive strains of a raucous military march. Every day at the same time the crowded sidewalks suddenly empty, swept clear as if by a giant hand. Down "the most beautiful avenue in the world," now empty and ghostlike, march, with disciplined and heavy tread, Hitler's noisy and arrogant "musicians," sent to bring gaiety to this city which has no heart for laughter.

Exactly the same scene repeats itself every day. With teutonic precision on the stroke of midday down the *Champs Elysees* they tramp to the *Place de la Concorde,* past the eagles of the American Embassy to the accompaniment of clattering and slamming of doors and windows, down to beneath the balcony of the Hotel Crillon, where, having delivered themselves of their horrible serenade to "the Governor" they strut away down the still and empty streets.

Perhaps you knew Paris; if you did, you will remember the thousand and one details of sights and sounds—the petulant tooting of the nervous little taxis in the traffic jams, the policemen with their continual irritable "Hurry up! Circulate! Circulate!" as they waved their white batons frantically; the cries of the newspapermen, "Late news final," "Paris Midi"; the mad zigzagging of the bicyclists in and out of the traffic. All that has gone. Instead is a silence. The silence of deserted streets and houses, only echoing night and day with the footsteps of the jackbooted tyrants.

After the first big influx of occupation troops which lasted ten days or so, the Germans sent comparatively few soldiers to Paris. Now the town is full of them. Well-disciplined, they march up and down the streets with their eternal military precision, yet with a lack of purpose, occasionally relaxing to sing in chorus one of their drinking songs. Literally thousands of officers fill the large cafes off the *Champs Elysees* and boulevards, making a great effort at extreme politeness, always elegant, spending their marks with great abandon on champagne and good food at every place they visit. Only a few weeks ago there started to arrive German women with their fat "frauishness," filling the large shops and crowding the small hotels. Most of them are wives and daughters of officers billeted somewhere in France.

The Metro now copes with almost the entire traffic of Paris, having reopened all its stations. There are practically no buses, cars, or motorcycles, owing to the lack of petrol.

The Germans have announced that they intend teaching the French the meaning of the word "order." They have organized a special school at the Prefecture of Police for training the traffic policemen, who have each been presented with white-painted batons a yard long, at the end of which is a sort of bull's-eye painted red, white, and black. The unfortunate agents are obliged to wave these stiffly up and down at arm's length in order to regulate the traffic. Gone is the little white truncheon and piercing tin whistle.

In spite of the lack of butter, of oil, and in spite of the small quantity of meat available, life is still fairly easy in Paris. In any case it is of a higher standard than in the provincial towns, and even of Vichy. The Parisian has become accustomed to take his place in a queue in order to buy his *bifteck,* without too much fuss. In the better restaurants it is still possible to get a fairly decent meal, and occasionally a good one. The Frenchman has not lost his habitual flair for making the best of indifferent materials with his culinary art. Even in the smartest restaurants there is no longer an a la carte menu. For sixty or seventy francs at chez Maxim's one gets hors-d'oeuvres, a joint, fruit, and coffee, and with it—up till now—one's ration of sugar.

By a tacit agreement, certain restaurants are left to the Germans by the Parisians. For example, the restaurant of the Ritz has been left exclusively to the German generals and their families. At the other end of the corridor—now closed—are all the Americans of Paris, talking at the tops of their voices. The great game is to find the small restaurants yet undiscovered by the Germans. There you stake your claim, feeling at home with your elbows on the crinkly paper tablecloth, and even daring to discuss, criticize, or condemn the Gestapo and all its brood. There, too, heads together, whispered and forbidden news goes round, its source mysterious and unknown. The proprietor of the restaurant—always, of course, the best informed—will tell you that the hospitals in Brittany and Normandy are full of German soldiers and officers.

The Germans early enforced a census of all empty apartments. Since then many of these flats have been "visited" and all valuables removed. Anyone wishing to leave for non-occupied France is only allowed to take one small suitcase, so terrified are the Nazis that any particle of their loot should be taken away.

The black-out is even more strict in Paris than in London. Nightlife is completely dead. Cinemas are open, but they close very early; they are not a great attraction, as they only show Germanized news and old French films. The only existing theatre is the *Comedie Francaise,* where to a half-empty house the classic repertories continue to be acted. Most of the night clubs are closed.

It is true, Paris has stayed Paris. They have not been able to alter the direction of the streets, nor the shape of the monuments. But at heart there is something so changed that one would imagine oneself in another city entirely. The policeman at the corner has lost his smile, as the population has lost its gaiety. The pavements are dirty, covered with rubbish, never cleaned up in time; old posters; there are even mobilization notices of September, 1939, hanging sadly. The Parisians have no more will to effort. They just let themselves go. What is the good? Everything will be changed, anyway!

Finally, there is no question but that the Germans are disliked in Paris; they are boycotted and avoided. But that does not mean that this hostility actually affects the Germans. The middle class, and in an even greater measure the big industrial, seem no longer able to produce any kind of fight. "The war has been lost; everything has been lost. Well, never mind, it cannot be helped; there is nothing to be done." If only one could come to an understanding with the Germans! But that seems so difficult; so they continue arguing with them and finally drop their hands.

The Church and War

MYLES D. BLANCHARD

What influences so many Christian ministers to declare themselves in favor of war as a means to an end? Is it the end, or is there a romance connected with war which intrigues even these leaders? No more confusing question has arisen in the mind of the ethical man than this relationship between force and the Christian church, and the result of our contemplation of it is anything but satisfactory in the light of morality.

The paradoxical position of the Christian leader who in one breath damns Communism because of the means it uses and in the next blesses a battalion of soldiers about to kill leaves one breathless with amazement. What conclusions are we forced to draw by such inconsistency? The answer seems to be that in the back of the average minister's mind is a complete antagonism to Communism's aims while in the same mind is a vague acceptance of the aims of war. Otherwise why should force not be accepted in both instances since it is not objected to in one?

The whole question of means versus ends is again opened up by such men as Reinhold Niebuhr and Frank Graham who, by their various statements and by the support they have given to movements designed to get us into the present war, have very plainly stated that a good end does not necessarily have to be pursued by a good means. Communism, not the kind of Communism that exists in Russia, is certainly an ideal which kind, loving men have dreamed of for years. The fact that the ideal has been raped does not mean that it is dead. The Kingdom of God, much talked about but little practiced as a way of living, is certainly akin to pure Communism, and it is towards this ideal that the socially conscious Christian has been trying to move. And when a group of men and women, without morals, motivated solely by expediency, declare that Communism can be realized only by the use of force, worker against owner, the Christian leaders the world over have rightly condemned such a program on the basis that equality and peace can never be reached by the method of bloodshed. Here, we all agree, is right thinking.

But along comes this group of hitherto noble men and they declare that in this present conflict great issues are at stake and that certain ends must be realized or everything is lost. And then, contrary to everything they have preached and taught up to that moment, they declare that as much as they hate to admit it the only way to safeguard civilization is to become uncivilized.

Where does this kind of thinking leave the Communist? The sincere Communist believes that when he is through, he will at least have a society which is done with murder, but the Christian minister who compromises his conscience and gives his blessing to murder has no promise but that the same old society will continue. Certainly the present war is an aftermath and a direct result of the last one, and certainly no intelligent man has any right to believe that this is to be the last war if the same economic and political systems are to survive it as survived the first World War. Thus is the Communist justified in questioning the ethics of the Christian minister who a few months ago was damning Communism's style of slaying while today blessing that of Capitalism.

Yet there must be some reason for this turnabout on the part of men who have formerly condemned war as a means of settling disputes. Either they are tragically mistaken, or they are not thinking or they are insincere, or they have been caught in the web of propaganda.

Reinhold Niebuhr, to take one example, is evidently motivated by escape, or the desire for it. In his most recent writings he throws to the wind his former conception of the program of the Kingdom and adheres to what seems to be a streamlined, modern version of Calvinism. Man, he seems to believe, is born possessed of inherent sin. Inherently sinful, he cannot be expected to make any kind of a spiritual ascent. Therefore, since he is not inclined towards morals he will revert to war. And since war is here and cannot be eradicated until man finds "salvation" we shall have to put up with it; more than that, as long as war is inevitable our problem as Christians is to decide which side, if it wins, will best serve the ends of Christianity. On this basis he backs Britain. Thus does Dr. Niebuhr escape his own responsibility towards social and ethical progress.

With Dr. Graham it appears to be a bit different. This great educator is not seeking an escape; rather he appears dazed at what has happened. He believes in freedom. No southerner has been more criticized than he. He has been called a Communist by most of the reactionary groups of the South. What he has been trying to do is to put the economic teachings of Jesus into effect below the Mason-Dixon line. He has not counted personal loss as important. He has not been fearful of name-calling and he has stood valiantly forth as a defender of the weak and underprivileged. As a hater of Fascism and Nazism he was accepted in the camp of the fellow travelers, whether he knew it or not.

But where Dr. Graham has slipped up in his thinking is in his firm belief that the only way to defeat Hilter is to become totally brutal and temporarily to put ideals, ethics, morals, and Christianity into the ash can. His attitude seems best summed up in this mythical declaration, "I love peace and by all the gods I'll fight for it!" Thus does this willingness to forget means as long as the end is kept in view lead him to declare that it is too bad but inevitable that innocent children starve in occupied Europe, since to feed them would feed aggression. Thus has he openly objected to the Hoover plan. What are a few children as long as Hitler is defeated? Dr. Graham would say that this is over-simplification but starvation is simplification, too; it is simply not getting enough to eat because certain so-called Christians will not give bread.

I have chosen these two men because they represent two different types of thinking within the church today. It is not unusual to find that Reverend So-and-So, yesterday a strong pacifist, is today turning his pulpit into a recruiting station and his prayers into a plea that more and better murders be committed. Tomorrow, after peace is declared, he will completely forget his interim and revert to his pacifism. Why? Why do these men forsake the Christian doctrine of nonresistance? One answer may be pressure. Under the present system of church management the minister is dependent upon the good will of his congregation if he expects to live. Again, he may forget that a scientific

formula is always constant, and when followed through the result is always the same. He may feel that whereas the last war ended in a debacle, this one, although it is patterned exactly as was the last one, may bring about an era of peace.

Or he may be swept off his feet by propaganda. When history is written, the story of British propaganda in Washington will amaze those who read it and their amazement will be based on the fact that it was allowed. If the President of the United States can so easily succumb, why should the ill-informed Christian minister be expected to be immune? Or he may be a militant Christian who accepts force as a way. His mind may be back with the Crusaders or further back with Constantine. Back with Jesus, he would have cut off the high priest's servant's ear. Or he would have been among the disciples for whom calling down fire was the only answer.

Regardless of the motivation behind the pro-war spirit among our Christian leaders, it is most certainly in evidence. Solemnly we may ask ourselves what to expect when the church of Jesus, the Prince of Peace, takes up the cause of mass murder. Here, we had thought, was the receptacle of love, justice, peace, and tolerance. Now we are faced with the fact that once more our last bulwark against inhumanity is crumbling. Comes peace and what? Can the church backtrack again, reverse its position once more, become pacifistic again? It can. But can it do it without losing the respect of thinking people? That is the question these Christian leaders refuse to face. Like Capitalism, perhaps, which believes it is all through anyway and is therefore out to get all that it can in its dying moments, the Church may feel that everything is lost and its only chance to survive is by a complete re-crucifixion of its founder. This, it may argue, is temporary disloyalty, but God who knows the hearts of all men will understand and forgive. To me, this is an untenable position.

Hitler Can't Win, But—

DAVID M. BLOCH

One need not be an expert on military affairs to realize that the Nazi stranglehold over Europe will finally be severed. The sawdust Caesars of our day will go tumbling from their mighty seats of power into the dust of oblivion. But though Hitler and his cohorts are doomed it is questionable whether democracy will survive. The present trend even in democratic lands towards dictatorship is not at all a healthy sign. If this should continue it is very plausible that all the sacrifices that have been made so far to combat the savage chieftain who set the world aflame may have been in vain.

A false optimism seems to prevail that Hitler's defeat will inevitably bring about the triumph of democracy. Even such a prophet of doom as H. G. Wells predicts that soon after the war is won by England, the world will be one free and happy family. Most of us evidently fail to see that it is not one man or party we are combating, but an ideology more deadly than all the modern destructive implements of war. Nazism as we know only too well by now is but naked savagery clothed in modern attire. It advocates the subjugation of weaker races, the enslavement of labor, and the suppression of all civil liberty. It has contempt for art, science, and literature. It ridicules religion, and glorifies brute force.

That some of these Nazi conceptions have already taken root in England and America is beyond dispute. In both countries there are a goodly number of active and passive barbarians who are eager to accept many, if not all, of Hitler's ideas. Nor are the governments of the two leading democracies hesitant in imitating Hitler and Mussolini. Under various pretexts they have already adopted a considerable part of the Nazi-Fascist program. In Great Britain as well as the United States, a powerful minority has abrogated to itself the right to dictate to the people.

Britain at least has some excuse to offer for this radical alteration in its governmental machinery. Being engaged in a deadly battle against a ruthless foe she must, so it is claimed, resort to some of the totalitarian methods to successfully carry on the war. But how can America justify its departure from the democratic way of life? The present administration has gradually drifted from its original New Deal program, and is following the dictates of "Big Business." The forgotten man is indeed forgotten. And there is not a murmur of protest coming from any source; the minority groups who have always battled against the intrenched interests have either been outlawed or sold out to the enemy. So that at present we have but one united party on the Roosevelt band wagon, all tooting the same horn.

The cry for more armaments, conscription of labor (we have already conscripted our youth for military service) and suppression of civil rights, is growing louder. We must at any cost, insist our leaders, protect our shores and save democracy both here and in England. But if we learned anything at all from history we ought to realize that democracy could never be preserved through such methods. By all means let us have an adequate defense to protect ourselves from invasion. But if we are not to engage in a war of aggression, is it necessary to pile up such huge armaments? And why must conscription and the curtailment of freedom be the prerequisites towards the preservation of democracy? Neither democratic Czechoslovakia nor France was able to save itself through these means. If anything, such measures helped to bring about their destruction.

England should and must be given all the moral and material aid at our disposal. She is fighting not only her battle but ours as well. Hitler must be crushed if the world is to breathe more freely. Britain, however, must state clearly her future policy towards the vanquished nations of Europe. We cannot expect genuine democracy to be established on the continent of Europe unless England relinquishes her present imperialistic rule over her colonies, and frees herself from the domination of her bankers and industrialists.

If democracy is to function, Uncle Sam too must alter his foreign and domestic policies. We cannot

indefinitely continue to exploit our Latin-American neighbors and still maintain friendly relations with them. And there is the unemployment problem facing us. This desperate army at the bottom cowed into submission by threats and clever propaganda remains an infected sore on our body politic. Democracy cannot very well exist amidst a people "half free and half slave."

This tendency on the part of many of our government officials and molders of public opinion to brand as enemies those who disagree with our present defense program is pernicious and anti-democratic. The mad witch hunt must cease if we really want to abolish despotism. Effective laws to check fifth column activities can be enacted without using the methods of the Ogpu or the Gestapo—the Dies committee take note. And these laws should apply to saboteurs among the powerful men on top as well as those on the bottom.

That the price of liberty is constant vigilance is more true today than ever before. Unless we in the democratic lands who are genuinely concerned about human values oppose by word and deed the reactionary forces among us we may find ourselves, after Hitler is defeated, in a real dilemma: America as well as Europe will be under the iron rule of a new totalitarianism. The dream of Hume, Diderot, Paine, and Jefferson will have been in vain.

Yes, Hitler will lose but so will democracy if we allow ourselves to be led as we have until now by a few ambitious politicians and greedy industrialists. It will lose if we continue to pay homage to wealth and power, and give no heed to the needs of the disinherited. The challenge of Hitlerism can be met in only one way: the complete repudiation of its ideas both in theory and practice. Then only will freedom ring and a new era dawn upon mankind.

We Must Avoid a Spiritual Black-Out

GUINIVERE HUNTER FOLEY

With the world so full of human suffering and war propaganda goading Americans on to the verge of hysteria, we all need constructive thoughts to guide and steer us clear of wrong thinking and a national spiritual black-out.

People of foreign lands are already bankrupt of their material possessions, liberties, and spiritual ideals, all because of "sheep thinking" and following an incompetent leader. They are bewildered, confused, and unable to comprehend the destructive forces at large that have brought about their present tragic bankruptcy of spirit.

Their days are filled with the horrors of modern warfare. Bombs, killings, hunger, and air-raid shelters take precedence over everything else in their lives, and all the beautiful and worthwhile things in life; religion, art, science, music and literature, have from necessity, been relegated to the background of their minds. As a result of this cruel mental adjustment, the law of self-preservation asserts itself and primitive emotions are stirred and brought to the surface—one thought uppermost in all minds, the will to survive!

No matter how earnestly human beings endeavor to adhere to religious and civilized principles, war will stimulate only primitive emotions, and will in time demand the right of way, making it impossible to remain on the straight and narrow road of civilized behavior. This mental detour will cause people of warring nations to revert to the instincts of animals and there will be a spiritual black-out—a gradual deterioration of the civilized world as we know it today. Men, women, and children will become lost souls, human wrecks on the sea of life.

Unless Americans make their days full of purpose and significance, cease talking about national emergencies, and do something constructive to prevent a spiritual black-out, a similar fate may await them.

Talk is cheap! The freedom of speech is a sacred privilege, and a privilege we all know that has been sadly taken advantage of in this country. There is too much talk in the world today, and far too little action! Vicious propaganda is widespread, attempting to undermine our democratic form of government. Foreign ambassadors are busily engaged in talking their countries out of world difficulties instead of intelligently acting to solve their state problems.

Every one is in a confused state of mind—trying to talk the other fellow into believing what he or she thinks is wrong with our system of government. This inane talk has made us a nation of skeptics—believing nothing we hear any more, and just about half of what we actually see!

It is not very important what we say nowadays, but what we will do within the next few months is vitally important to the best interests of all, if we are to avert the catastrophe of becoming involved in another world war. Constructive thinking is not sufficient to fight the invisible destructive forces at work in this great land of ours—constructive actions must accompany constructive thinking.

Can you do your share in preventing a national spiritual black-out?

Yes, indeed you can! Endeavor to help those less fortunate than yourself. Be kind and tolerant of the other fellow's church and political loyalties. Take an active part in church, social, and civic organizations in your communities.

Study your government and the Constitution of the United States and strive to become a useful and sane-thinking citizen. Above everything else, be grateful for the freedom of the press and freedom of speech in this country, and believe in your hearts that with these two powerful allies, democracy in America, as we know it, can never fail!

Remember, also, that helping the other fellow will add greatly to your own peace of mind, and help you to live happily and harmoniously with all mankind, regardless of race, color, or creed.

This kind of social behavior will have a tendency to light up the minds and hearts of people all over the world, and make a universal spiritual black-out impossible!

The Study Table

Logical and Evangelistic

THE WORLD'S NEED OF CHRIST. *By Charles A. Ellwood. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 237 pp.* $2.00.

Here is an important volume with a foreword by Samuel McCrea Cavert, General Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

The author holds no untutored obscurantist attitude toward religion or sacred religious records. When he says that the world needs Christ, he makes it plain that he means the world needs nothing so much as to live in the spirit of Christ. In the opening chapter, Professor Ellwood shows how far the modern world is from imitating Christ in the spirit of his life.

There follow four chapters on the "Neglect of Christ": (1) in science and philosophy; (2) in religion and the church; (3) in business and industry; and last (4) in politics and international relations.

Many, although not all, scientists have completely neglected not only Christ as though a half-mythical character or a hopelessly antiquated teacher, but also the objective data of the Christ way of life when lived by such as the Quakers "and a few other Christian sects," who are "to be exempted from" the charge of having failed to imitate the Master. Equally disastrous has been philosophy's neglect of the mighty philosophy that Jesus proclaimed and lived. "It should not be difficult to bring the teachings of Christ to the tests of science and philosophy. Christ challenges science and philosophy not less than religion." Yet, despite this the charge stands that both science and philosophy have neglected to study the objective facts of Christian living with the result that the hoi polloi get the impression that Christianity is both unscientific and unphilosophic. Immanuel Kant is the chief of the philosophers who have not neglected Christ. He is the shining exception to the general indictment. "Thus is religion, too, reduced to a form of supernatural consolation for the individual in the suffering and vicissitudes of life, or to devotion to some materialistic political program, or to mere approval of social custom."

If scientists and philosophers have been unscientific and unphilosophical in neglecting Christ and the study of His way of life, what excuse can exist for the neglect of Christ in religion and in the Church that bears his name? "Some cynic has said that the only thing on which the numerous Christian sects agree is the impracticability of the teachings of Christ." "Not only has the church adapted itself to the pagan customs of society, but much of historical Christianity has ignored the teachings of Christ and substituted for those teachings theological doctrines of which Christ said nothing." In the development of Christianity how true that "theological doctrines, instead of being made a mere help to the Christian life, were shoved into the foreground, and grew until they obscured the teachings of Christ."

Proverbial to readers of UNITY is the neglect of the Christ attitude by business and industry. "As Dewey long ago maintained, much of business and industry in the capitalistic system has been essentially a hunt for wealth, and hence a modification of the primitive hunting pattern, just as war was another justification of that pattern." "Class conflict, if not class war, becomes an ever-present and ominous reality."

If business and industry have neglected Christ, much more so have politics and international relations. Sheer paganism like that of ancient Rome with its emperor as a god exists in Japan and other modern states. "Success at any price" has been the object of our pagan states. The state has demanded supreme loyalty, even that which belongs only to God, and, alas, so-called Christians all too often have rushed to give their allegiance to the state rather than to Christ! Force and expediency have guided international relations into the dilemma of mutual suicide for the nations.

Disavowing a "dogmatic pacifism," our author asserts that "the follower of Christ must always be a peace-seeker and a peace-maker." Yet Dr. Ellwood still believes that nations must have even under the spirit of Christ the right of self-defense by armed means. Still he pleads for Christ-controlled individuals to lead the nations to build a world federal union with world courts and world police. While small nations, he argues, must be protected "in their rights just as we protect the weak in the community," "this very obvious Christian duty does not necessitate coöperation with a war system or with a method of settling international quarrels and disputes by means of war." Christ must be put by the Church before any national loyalty, if the world is to be redeemed from the pagan war system.

What a mighty chapter is the last one on "The Christian Reconstruction of Our Civilization"! As Harry Overstreet has reminded us, twice has mankind sought redemption through something outside himself. Once through a supernatural deity, which mistake led him to religious wars and confusion. Again through physical nature man has sought redemption. Seeking control of nature, men have found another kind of hell, "exploitation, wage slavery, child labor, profiteering, racketeering, wars of commerce." "The teachings of Christ have not failed. They have never been tried by our civilization on an extended scale." The church as the "sole repository of the Christian tradition . . . should become Jesus Christ alive in the world today."

"The concrete program of the church for the Christian reconstruction of our civilization should consist of three parts." First, it must combat the sensate character of our civilization with affirmations of the eternity of spiritual values. Second, it must teach "the need and absolute obligation of universal love." Third, it must arouse enthusiasm among its members for the building of Christ's Kingdom in this world. Then, too, the church needs to remember that it has recently lost "the mass of modern women," the colleges in the main, and labor. Yet its task is not hopeless. The way is a narrow one of necessity, "for there are always many ways of going wrong while usually there is only one way of going right." Yet this is the only hope for the world of men: "to put Christ at the center of their relationships," as John Wesley suggested even in his day.

The book is compelling in its logic, evangelistic (in the best sense) in its appeal; and scientific as a basis for the better understanding of the task of the Christian Church.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

BOOK NOTES BY CHARLES A. HAWLEY

Aspects of the Bible

THE BIBLE. *By Walter Russell Bowie. New York: Association Press.* 68 *pp.* 50 *cents.*

This excellent book by Professor Bowie of Union Theological Seminary is the latest addition to the Hazen Books on Religion. The purpose of this series is to present briefly and inexpensively various interpretations of present-day Christianity. The series is sponsored by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation. Professor Bowie's essay presents the literary aspects of the Bible, together with its contemporary religious aspects. It is charmingly written and deserves a wide reading. Such a book as this can do much to dispel the notion that the Bible is outmoded.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

The Ancient Aramaic

THE NEW TESTAMENT ACCORDING TO THE EASTERN TEXT. *Translated from the original Aramaic sources by George M. Lamsa. Philadelphia: A. J. Holman Company.* 527 *pp.* $3.00.

Within the past decade a mighty controversy has raged about the original language of the New Testament. More and ever more converts have been made to the position that the Greek versions are translations from the original Aramaic. Professor Torrey has done pioneer work in this field. Lamsa goes beyond Professor Torrey and holds that the Aramaic, or Syriac as the Christian Church terms the language, is really the original from which the Greek was made. For the earliest Gospels this is doubtless correct. It is also probably the background of the first half of *Acts*. Until further researches prove the disputed points, every student of the Bible must be grateful to Mr. Lamsa, who is a native Aramæan, for this translation of the Peshitta, the name given to the common version used in the Aramaic-speaking portion of the church.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

America's Social Gospel

THE RISE OF THE SOCIAL GOSPEL IN AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM, 1865-1915. *By Charles Howard Hopkins. New Haven: Yale University Press.* 352 *pp.* $3.00.

This important book is the fourteenth in the Yale Studies in Religious Education. Its author has traced the development of the Social Gospel in America from the close of the Civil War to the beginning of the first World War. It goes without argument that the social element in Christianity comes from the prophets through Jesus. The Gospel of Luke puts special emphasis on this characteristic. It was left, however, to America to make the application of the Good News to the economic as well as to the personal life of the nation. This point, however, should not be overstressed. England influenced America in this respect through Kingsley, Maurice, Massey, and Christian Socialism from 1848 on. Likewise the continent brought its influence especially through Hermann Kutter around 1908. It seems to the present reviewer that some space should be given to Gerald Massey who lectured in America in 1873-1874 and again in 1884. Massey stirred the mind of America to the application of the Gospel to capital and labor and the entire social set-up, as the present reviewer showed in his article on "Gerald Massey and America" in *Church History* for December, 1939. Dr. Hopkins promises a further study which shall bring the development from the beginning of the first World War through the New Deal. Let us hope this study will not long be delayed. This book is one of the most important books written in America during the last fifty years. It brings out the very aspect to which we need to give our thought, the social history preceding the world chaos of today. If any part of what we call civilization is to be saved, it will be by a thoroughgoing application of the Gospel to present-day life.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

More Light on George Eliot

GEORGE ELIOT AND JOHN CHAPMAN, WITH CHAPMAN'S DIARIES. *By Gordon S. Haight. New Haven: Yale University Press.* 261 *pp.* $2.75.

This intensely interesting and important book is long overdue. Mr. Haight has begun an important work which the present reviewer hopes he will continue until we have a more truthful picture of George Eliot. This book, written throughout with accurate and meticulous scholarship, gives an account of George Eliot's relationship to John Chapman. Chapman, who lived from 1822 to 1894, is known to historians as physician, author, and publisher.

Beginning life as an apprentice to a watchmaker, Chapman spent some time in travel, and then settled down to study medicine. In 1851 he began to edit the *Westminster Review,* and, although he wrote treatises on the science of medicine, he is best known for his editorial work. In September, 1851, George Eliot came to board in the Chapman home, and acted as assistant editor of the *Westminster Review* until 1853. During this period Gerald Massey, the poet, also frequented the Chapman home which became a sort of international rendezvous for the literati. It was during this period that Chapman, Massey, and others, became intensely interested in reform. Later in her *Felix Holt,* George Eliot, according to tradition, made Gerald Massey the hero. This should be interesting to Americans, since Gerald Massey later visited America and, in a way, became one of the originators of the American Social Gospel. Another link with America was Chapman's great admiration for Emerson, and when the latter was in London he visited Chapman and thereafter had business relations with him over a long period of time. These reasons, quite apart from the popularity of George Eliot in America, make this book of absorbing interest.

Mr. Haight's work is the first original work done on George Eliot's letters and journals since the biography by Cross. These sources, now by good chance in the Yale University Library, reveal the fact that Cross omitted most of that part of George Eliot's life while she assisted in the editorship of the *Westminster Review.* Yet this period was of great importance in transforming the hitherto unknown scholar into the most famous woman of her generation. The narrative as told here is drawn largely from the hitherto unpublished diaries of Chapman. The account of the discovery of the diaries is in itself an interesting story. Every student of English literature must study this book. Let us hope Mr. Haight will follow this volume with the letters of George Eliot, edited with the same scholarly zeal which he has so ably demonstrated in the present volume.